medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.13.24315408; this version posted October 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Religion, Politics, and Policy Related to Age-Adjusted Cancer, Heart Disease, Infant Mortality and COVID-19 Death Rates, U.S. States 2018-2021

Leon S. Robertson

Professor Adjunct

Yale University School of Public Health

Email: leon.robertson@yale.edu

Abstract

The role of religion and politics in the responses to the coronavirus pandemic raises the question of their influence on the risk of other diseases. This study focuses on age-adjusted death rates of cancer, heart disease, and infant mortality per 1000 live births before the pandemic (2018-2019) and COVID-19 in 2020-2021. Seven hypothesized predictors of health effects were analyzed by examining their correlation to age-adjusted death rates among U.S. states – percent who pray once or more daily, Republican influence on state health policies as indicated by the percentage vote for Trump in 2016, median family income divided by a cost-of-living index, the Gini income inequality index, urban concentration of the population, physicians per capita, and public health expenditures per capita. Since many people practice religion independent of formal ceremonies, the percentage of people who claim to pray daily in each state was used as an indicator of potential religious influence. All of the death rates were higher in states where more people claim to pray daily and where Trump received a larger percentage of the vote. The rates were consistently lower in states where public health expenditures were higher. Only COVID-19 was correlated to physicians per capita, lower where there were more physicians. Corrected statistically for the other factors, income per cost of living explains no variance. Heart disease and COVID-19 death rates were higher in areas with more income inequality.

Religion, Politics, and Policy Related to Age-Adjusted Cancer, Heart Disease, Infant Mortality and COVID-19 Death Rates, U.S. States 2018-2021

Introduction

The coronavirus pandemic tested medical, political, and economic resources worldwide. Despite its economic and scientific resources, the U.S. had among the highest death rates in democratic countries. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's response mainly were recommendations regarding distancing, mask use, and testing. Unreliable testing equipment sent to the states had to be recalled delaying the testing of the sick. The government sent stimulus checks to individuals to stimulate the economy. Masking and distancing recommendations were widely resisted, especially where they were mandated, but free tests at pharmacies, drive-in test sites, and checks were popular. The on-demand testing was associated with increased virus spread as negative tests were promoted to make travel decisions with insufficient emphasis on quarantine if one tested positive. The public health system, underfinanced in many states, was unprepared to identify and contact persons exposed to those infected. On 70 percent of the days in U.S. states in 2020-2021, there were not enough tracing personnel to interview the infected, much less trace their contacts. People with negative tests traveled and came in

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.13.24315408; this version posted October 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

contact with infected people who would not quarantine or had no symptoms. The stimulus checks coupled with shortages of goods due to supply-chain disruptions increased inflation that more than wiped out the value of the checks. The major accomplishment of the federal government was the effort to develop vaccines that turned out to be effective beyond expectations. Getting people to use them was more difficult (Robertson, 2023).

After a CDC spokesperson issued dire warnings regarding the virus in February 2020, then-President Trump took over televised public briefings, saying the virus would disappear and recommending treatment that had no scientific basis. After the initial national shutdown in the spring of 2020, the control of limitations on travel, size of gatherings, and required mask use and vaccination fell to the states as did the purchase of protection equipment for medical care providers. The issues were politicized. The testing and political effects were independent and additive. Corrected for crowding in housing and various venues and other risk factors, COVID-19 death rates were higher in counties that had more negative tests per capita and, independently, a greater percentage of Trump votes (Robertson, 2021). Republican governors, with a few exceptions, were less likely to impose restrictions, and a few even denied vaccine effectiveness. Fox News and right-wing radio broadcasts argued against the science. A poll found that Fox News watchers' confidence in the CDC for accurate information declined from about 85 percent in early 2020 to 19 percent two years later while remaining above 80 percent among CNN and MSNBC watchers. By 2022 Fox News watchers' self-reported mask use was 16 percent compared to 60 percent of people who watched the other networks (Jackson, Newall, Diamond et al., 2022). Some forty percent of health professionals received death threats. Restricting attendance at religious services was particularly controversial and some religious leaders also opposed mask use and vaccines (Robertson, 2023).

These events magnified a difference in the worldviews of scientists and religious believers that have affected individual behavior and public policy since scientific information began discrediting some religious beliefs centuries ago. Many believers think that their lives and events, such as natural disasters and diseases, are caused by a supernatural spirit (or more if you count Satan and others), often seen as punishment for sin or tests of faith. Scientific research frequently challenges these beliefs by finding that descriptions of human origins in ancient religious texts are myths and that disasters and diseases are part of the evolution of natural processes (Fortey R., 1999). Most scientists, motivated by curiosity, improvement of the human condition, or personal fame, do not set out to deliberately discredit religion. Many scientists are also religious but compartmentalize their beliefs from their scientific work (Eklund, et al., 2016). That is not to say that scientists are always right. Scientific findings are subject to revision based on better data and consideration of alternative explanations. Scientists also make mistakes by not following up to be sure that assumptions of the consequences of their recommendations are met. Failure to recognize that many people who tested positive for COVID-19 were not reporting contacts and not following quarantine recommendations is an example (Robertson, 2024). Some scientists sell out to commercial interests. The Pied Piper of COVID-19 testing in the U.S. was a scientist-consultant at a testing company that he later joined full-time (Hancock, 2022).

In recent decades in the U.S. religious fundamentalists have increasingly influenced Republican politics. Republican operatives and a fundamentalist evangelist formed an organization called The Moral Majority that persuaded many evangelistic clergy and their followers to support Republican candidates. However, most African American fundamentalists and some religious liberals remained loyal to the Democratic Party (Alberta, 2023). By the second decade of the 21st Century Republicans had about a 20-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.13.24315408; this version posted October 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

percentage point advantage among Protestants (Pew Research Center, 2024). Traditional wealthy Republicans who opposed higher tax rates, regulation of their businesses, and aid to the economically disadvantaged had new allies.

While the roles of religious believers, politicians, and scientists in preventing the incidence and severity of the coronavirus pandemic have been studied, less attention has focused on their possible roles in other leading causes of death. The scientific literature increasingly focuses on "social determinants of health" such as income inequality (Braveman, Egerter, and Williams, 2011) raising concern that environmental factors are neglected (Rabinowitz and Barry, 2024). Both socioeconomic and environmental factors are affected by laws and regulations influenced by politics and political constituencies leading to the idea of "political determinants of health" (Brooks, Godziewski, and Thibaud, 2024).

The scientific study of religious beliefs and practices regarding diseases and injuries mainly focuses on whether individual risk is associated with prayer or attending religious gatherings. The results are mixed. A large-sample longitudinal study of cardiovascular disease among women found that adjusted for other risk factors, prayer, and reading religious literature were associated with subsequent increased cardiovascular risk (Salmoirago-Blotcher, et al., 2016). A study of African-American church attendance and subsequent mortality found that deaths were lower among regular attendees (Ellison, et al., 2000). Church attendees were found to live longer in another study but shorter lives were associated with private religious practices (Musik, House, and Williams, 2004). The focus on individual behavior and outcomes ignores the role of government in improving public health historically and the role of religion and science in the process.

Scientists discovered agents of infectious diseases, their carriers, vaccines, sanitary water treatment, and pasteurization to reduce pathogens in certain beverages and foods. As a result of laws, standards, and regulations based on science, many diseases that were prominent killers in the past, mainly infectious diseases, are rare or nonexistent in most years today (Tippet, 2014). For example, no case of smallpox has occurred for decades since the last pockets were identified and eliminated by vaccination of rings around the areas where the remaining cases were located. The required smallpox vaccination to attend school was rescinded decades ago. Historically some, but not all, religious leaders and libertarians often objected to public health campaigns and laws. In 1721, Zebediah Boylston was vigorously opposed by clerics and others in his attempt to get the population of Boston vaccinated against smallpox. The prominent Puritan minister, Cotton Mather, supported Boylston (Harvard Library, 2024).

There is a large variation in recent leading causes of death (cancer, heart disease, and COVID-19) among U.S. states. In 2018-2019, the range in age-adjusted death rates was: cancer (120-180), heart disease (120-248). In 2020-2021 the range for COVID-19 deaths was 10-fold (14-140). This paper reports an analysis of U.S. state differences in the mentioned age-adjusted death rates by cause before the pandemic (2018-2019) and COVID-19 during the first two years of the pandemic (2020-2021) correlated to religion, politics, economic factors, physician accessibility, public health expenditures per capita and urban residency. Infant mortality per 1000 live births was added they are known to be correlated to inequality (MacDorman, 2011). The variations in the rates among U.S. states are examined separately for each cause of death to test the hypothesis that prayer reduces death risk, controlling statistically the other factors.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.13.24315408; this version posted October 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Methods and Data

Seven hypothesized predictors of health effects were analyzed by examining their correlation to age-adjusted state death rates – percent who pray once or more daily, Republican influence on state health policies as indicated by the percentage vote for Trump in 2016, median family income divided by a cost-of-living index, the Gini income inequality index, urban concentration of the population, physicians per capita, and public health expenditures per capita. Since many people practice religion independent of formal ceremonies, the percentage of people who claim to pray daily in each state was used as an indicator of potential religious influence. The references to data sources of the mentioned variables are noted in Table 1.

Table 1. Data Sources

Daily Prayer	Lipka and Wormald, 2016
Trump Vote 2016	CNN, 2016
Median family Income/cost of living	Moneyrates.com, 2019.
Income Inequality (Gini)	U.S. Census Bureau, 2019
Physicians Per population	National Center for Health Statistics, 2019.
Percent Urban	U.S. Census Bureau, 2024
Unemployment	U.S Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2016
Public Health Expenditures Per Population	National Association of County and City Health Officials, 2019.
Age-adjusted Mortality Rates	National Institute of Minority Health and Health Disparities, 2018-2021
Infant Mortality Rate	National Center for Health Statistics, 2018-2019

Because of the collinearity of physicians per population, the percentage who pray daily, and the Trump vote, three least squares regression equations were employed to assess the potential distortion of coefficients predicting deaths: 1. Deaths as a function of the percent who pray daily, 2. Deaths as a function of the percent who pray daily, physicians per population, public health expenditures per population, and 3. Deaths as a function of percent who pray daily, physicians per population, public health expenditures per population, income per cost of living, income inequality, and percent urban. Comparison of the change in coefficients and R^2 suggests the relative association of the different factors to interstate variation in death rates. In a separate analysis, the percentage of the vote captured by Trump was substituted for the percentage who pray daily in the equations. The regression coefficients were similar to those using daily prayer but the R-squares were lower. The following results are based on the equations using daily prayer as the politico-religious variable.

Results

Correlations among the potential predictor variables are shown in Table 2. Most are not statistically significant. The most important are the correlations among physicians per population, the percentage who pray daily, and the Trump vote. On average there are fewer physicians for potential access by the ill in states with more Trump voters and people who say they pray daily. The urban percent is less

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.13.24315408; this version posted October 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

correlated to the percent daily prayer than the Trump vote percentage, another reason to use the equations using percent prayer.

Table 2. Least-squares correlation coefficients among predictor variables

	Trump Vote 2016	Income/ Cost of Living	Gini Index	Physicians /pop	Public Health Expend/Pop	Urban	Unemployment October 2016
Percent Pray Daily	.59	-.17 ns)	.11 (ns)	-.69	-.23 (ns)	-.39	.27 (ns)
Percent Trump Vote 2016		.05 (ns)	-.12 (ns)	-.67	-.25 (ns)	-.54	.09 (ns)
Median Income/cost of living			-.23 (ns)	.09 (ns)	-.37	.17 (ns)	-.25 (ns)
Inequality				.21 (ns)	-.08 (ns)	.26 (ns)	.47
Physicians/Pop					.10 (ns)	.25 (ns)	-.12 (ns)
Public Health Expenditures/pop						.04 (ns)	.05 (ns)
Percent Urban							.08 (ns)

ns = not statistically significant at p=.05, two-tailed.

Table 3. Least-squares regression coefficients and 95 % confidence intervals on predictor variables and cancer age-adjusted mortality rate per 100,000 population, U.S. States 2018-2019

Percent Pray Daily	.736 (.518, 1.282)	.658 (2.111, 1.105)	.530 (.123, .927)
Physicians per Population		-.004 (-.080, .072)	.015 (-.052, .082)
Public Health Expenditures/pop		-.154 (-.273, -.035)	-.159 (-.260, -.058)
Income/Cost of Living			-.008 (-.038, .022)
Inequality (Gini)			.973 (-.911, 2.857)
Percent Urban			-.565 (-.767, -.383)
Intercept	109.029	120.960	125.892
Adjusted R square	.22	.29	.61

The analysis of age-adjusted cancer deaths per 100,000 population is presented in Table 3. Contrary to the hypothesis that prayer reduces risk, more cancer deaths per capita occur in states where people more often pray daily. The coefficient on prayer is lower when the significant inverse coefficients of public health expenditures and percent urban are included in the equations but remains a statistically

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.13.24315408; this version posted October 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

significant factor. The coefficients on physicians per population, income per cost of living, and inequality are not statistically significant.

The results in Table 4 indicate similar conclusions for heart disease deaths per population. The only difference is that heart disease deaths are higher in states with more income inequality. In both analyses, R^2 increases with the addition of additional variables.

Table 4. Least-squares regression coefficients and 95 % confidence intervals on predictor variables and heart disease age-adjusted mortality rate per 100,000 population, U.S. States 2018-2019

Percent Pray Daily	2.211 (1.519, 2.903)	2.080 (1.250, 2.909)	1.480 (.597, 2.216)
Physicians per Population		-.011 (-.152, .130)	-.047 (-.192, .098)
Public Health Expenditures/pop		-.224 (-.465, -.023)	-.242 (-.457, -.025)
Income/Cost of Living			-.025 (-.089, .039)
Inequality (Gini)			4.278 (.198, 8.358)
Percent Urban			-.722 (-1.139, -.374)
Intercept	49.702	69.358	-11.009
Adjusted R square	.45	.475	.603

That is not true for infant mortality per 1000 live births shown in Table 5. The increase in deaths in states where people pray more frequently is similar irrespective of other factors. Infant mortality is lower when public health expenditures per capita are higher. The R^2 did not improve much by introducing additional variables.

Table 5. Least-squares regression coefficients and 95 % confidence intervals on predictor variables and infant mortality rate per 1000 live births, U.S. States 2018-2019

Percent Pray Daily	.088 (.066, .110)	.081 (.054, .107)	.087 (.057, .117)
Physicians per Population		-.001 (-.005, .003)	.001 (-.003, .005)
Public Health Expenditures/pop		-.006 (-.012, .000)	-.007 (-.015, -.0004)
Income/Cost of Living			-.001 (-.003, .001)
Inequality (Gini)			-.065 (-.207, .076)
Percent Urban			-.013 (-.027, .001)
Intercept	.997	2.007	6.359
Adjusted R square	.57	.58	.62

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.13.24315408; this version posted October 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

All of the variables except public health expenditures per capita were predictive of COVID-19 deaths (Table 6). Increased deaths were associated with the percentage who pray daily and income inequality, but were lower where there were more physicians per population, more public health expenditures per population, higher incomes per cost of living, and a greater proportion of the population in urban areas. Although the coefficient on daily prayer declined when the other variables were introduced in the equation, the increase in R^2 when the other variables were introduced was not as great as was the case with cancer and heart disease.

Table 6. Least-squares regression coefficients and 95 % confidence intervals on predictor variables and COVID-19 age-adjusted mortality rate per 100,000 population, U.S. States 2020-2021

Percent Pray Daily	2.349 (1.802, 2.896)	1.970 (1.314, 2.626)	1.139 (.477, 1.800)
Physicians per Population		-.112 (-.223, -.001)	-.206 (-.315, -.097)
Public Health Expenditures/pop		.003 (-.172, .178)	-.044 (-.205, .117)
Income/Cost of Living			-.047 (-.095, .001)
Inequality (Gini)			5.509 (3.188, 7.830)
Percent Urban			-.245 (-.555, .067)
Intercept	159.097	-8.043	-130.948
Adjusted R square	.60	.62	.74

Table 7. Least squares regression coefficients and confidence intervals of predictors of physicians per population separately for Trump vote and percentage daily prayer

	Physicians per Population	Physicians per Population
Percent Trump Vote		-4.394 (-5.735, -3.053)
Percent Pray Daily	-4.189 (2.845, 5.532)	
Percent Urban	.100 (-.758,.958)	-1.103 (-2088, -.118)
Median Family Income/Cost of Living Index	.036 (-.085, .157)	.127 (.006, .248)
Income Inequality Index	13.714 (6.471, 20.597)	7.462 (.836, 14.088)
Intercept	-176.853	109.137

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.13.24315408; this version posted October 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Adjusted R square	.47	.50

Separate analyses of physician distribution among the states relative to the percent daily prayer of residents and percent vote for Trump are shown in Table 7. The major difference is the coefficient on urban which is negative relative to the percent urban when Trump's vote is included as a predictor but not when the percent daily prayer is a predictor. It appears that more physicians prefer a less urban environment unless it is in a state where the politics are more dominated by Republicans.

Discussion

A major limitation of this study is the inference of individual behavior from aggregate data. The consistent association of daily prayer with higher death rates could be at least partly because some prayerful people neglect preventive and ameliorative behavior. As noted in the introduction, studies of health outcomes related to religious practices are mixed. A review of twelve studies of resistance to vaccines concludes that the religious are less likely to be vaccinated (Tiwana and Smith, 2024). Studies of diet and exercise find little or no correlation to religious beliefs (Ansari, Soltero, Lorenzo, et. al., 2017; Kim and Sobal, 2004). It is likely that the correlation between frequent prayer and death rates in this study partly results from prayerful people's tendency to support state and federal governments that neglect less fortunate people and oppose environmental protection standards. Opposition to vaccination does not explain correlations to cancer, heart disease, and infant mortality for which there are no vaccines. In a 2016 survey, the more prayerful were more likely to agree that aid to the poor "does more harm than good" and that "stricter environmental laws and regulations cost too many jobs and hurt the economy" (Pew Research Center, 2024b). Extensive research indicates that job loss related to environmental regulation is largely offset by jobs created to comply with and enforce the regulation (Hafstead and Williams III, 2020).

The other most consistent finding is lower death rates in states with more public health expenditures per capita. The low negative correlation between Trump support and daily prayer with state expenditures for state and local public health departments combined with the consistent correlations of such expenditures with lower death rates before the pandemic suggests the effectiveness of some of their efforts similar to previous research (Brown, Martinez-Gutierez and Navob, 2014). In 2019, a state and local public health agency survey noted the percentage of particular programs. The most prominent were tobacco, alcohol, and drugs (74%), emergency preparedness (62%), infectious disease and vaccination (60%), food safety (48%), obesity/physical activity (45%), and wastewater/sanitation (39%). The agencies that served larger populations had higher percentages of each effort. State and local health departments can call on the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention when illnesses of unknown origin occur. Revenues to support public health departments are diversified – federal direct and passthrough (27%), local sources (25%), state sources (21%), Medicare/Medicaid (10%), and others combined (17%). These also vary by the size of the population served; state sources per capita are used more in less populated areas (National Association of County and City Health Officials, 2019). Therefore, it is not surprising that state politics affected public health activities less than one might think. The anti-public health rhetoric and threats during the pandemic seem to have accelerated the trend of state and local public health professionals to retire or seek alternative careers. A study of changes in state and local public health staff trends from 2017 to 2021 does not portend well for the health of their states.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.13.24315408; this version posted October 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Nearly half left the agencies including three of every four younger than thirty-six (Leider JP, Castrucci BC, Robins M, et al., 2023).

Inferences from the lack of correlation between physicians per capita and death rates other than COVID-19 should be tempered by the likelihood that the coefficients may be distorted by collinearity. The repeatedly verified clinical trials of many medical prescriptions and procedures are witness to their benefits but do not guarantee that they are applied appropriately or that the recipients of treatment comply with instructions. Each must be judged based on evidence of correct application and compliance. The efficacy of medical care is partly offset by medical errors, deaths from which are estimated at more than 200,000 per year in the U.S. (Rodziewicz TL, Houseman B, Vaqar S, et al., 2024), competing with unintentional injuries as the third leading cause of death after heart disease and cancer.

The correlation of economic factors with death rates varies by mode of death. Corrected statistically for the other factors, income per cost of living explains no variance. Heart disease and COVID-19 death rates were higher in areas with more income inequality. Numerous studies have found the same. A study of 14 risk factors for heart disease found that most of them were more prevalent among people of lower socioeconomic status (Woodward, Oliphant, Lowe et al., 2003). COVID-19 deaths per capita were substantially higher among people employed in health care (Hawkins, Davis, and Kriebel, 2020) and essential low-wage work that could not be done remotely (Matthay, Duchowny, Riley, et al., 2022). The lack of correlation between income inequality and infant mortality is contrary to previous research. The role of religion in behavior during and post-pregnancy among the economically disadvantaged, particularly ethnic minorities, deserves researchers attention.

If more Christians would follow the example of Cotton Mather and place humanitarian needs first on their agenda, death rates would likely decline. Many Christian fundamentalist religious believers have abandoned the humanitarian ethics of Jesus in the hope that tyrants like those in the Old Testament will protect their religion. The misnamed “culture wars” that are not yet violent threaten to become so (Wintemute, Crawford, Robinson et al., 2024). We can survive longer as individuals and as a society if we rely on scientifically verified evidence rather than the fantasists and liars who use the Internet and other media to deceive Christians and others and threaten scientists, health practitioners, and government officials.

The centuries-old struggle between scientists who understand the fragility of life threatened by unseen biological, chemical, and physical forces and religious believers who think that an unseen all-knowing, all-powerful spirit rules human events is being played out in the politics of the 21st Century. The result could be a mass extinction by a biological plague, warming beyond our ability to cope, or a nuclear winter far worse than any historical ice age (Diamond, 2004, Robertson, 2024). Some scientists, paid by industries who stand to lose money from the reduction of the hazards they generate, ignore humanitarian ethics to deny evidence of global warming, some of the same ones who, in the past, denied that smoking increases the risk of cancer and heart disease (Oreskes and Conway, 2010).

References

Ansari S., Soltero E.G., Lorenzo E. et al. The impact of religiosity on dietary habits and physical activity in minority women participating in the Health is Power (HIP) study. Preventive Medicine Reports, 2017. 5:210-213. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2016.12.012.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.13.24315408; this version posted October 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Antono B., Bazemore, A. ,Dankwa-Mullan, I., et al.,. Primary Care in the United States: A Chartbook of Facts and Statistics. 2021. https://www.graham-center.org/content/dam/rgc/documents/publications-reports/reports/primary-care-chartbook.pdf

Braveman P, Egerter S and Williams DR. The Social Determinants of Health: Coming of Age. Annual Reviews in Public Health. 2011. 32:381–98.

Brooks E, Godziewski C, and Thibaud D. The Political Determinants of Health and the European Union. Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law. 49 (5): 673–689. https://doi.org/10.1215/03616878-11257064

Brown TT, Martinez-Gutierez MS and Navob B. The impact of changes in county public health expenditures on general health in the population. Health Economics Policy and Law. 2014. 9:251-269. https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/hecpol9&div=20&id=&page=

Bureau of Labor Statistics. State Unemployment Rates, August 2014 to August 2024. 2024. https://www.bls.gov/charts/state-employment-and-unemployment/state-unemployment-rates-animated.htm

CNN. Results of the 2016 presidential elections in the United States. 2016. https://www.statista.com/statistics/630799/preliminary-results-of-the-2016-presidential-election/

Diamond J. Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed. New York: Penguin Books, 2004.

Fortey R. Life: A Natural History of the First Four Billion Years of Life on Earth. New York: Knopf Doubleday, 1999.

Hafstead MAC and Williams III RC. Jobs and environmental regulation. In Kotchen MJ, Deryugina T, and Wolfram CD (eds.) Environmental and Energy Policy and the Economy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2020. https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/706799

Hancock, J. Covid expert joins exodus into business, where science parlays into profits. KFF Health News. 2022. https://kffhealthnews.org/news/article/michael-mina-emed-industry-academia-covid-rapid-tests/

Harvard Library. The Boston smallpox epidemic, 1721. 2024. https://curiosity.lib.harvard.edu/contagion/feature/the-boston-smallpox-epidemic-1721

Hawkins D, Davis L, Kriebel D. COVID-19 deaths by occupation, Massachusetts, March 1–July 31, 2020. American Journal of Industrial Medicine. 64:238–244. 2020. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.23227

Jackson C, Newall M, Diamond J, et al. Snapshot of America at the two-year pandemic mark. 2022. https://www.ipsos.com/en-us/news-polls/two-years-of-COVID

KFF. Hospital Emergency Room Visits per 1,000 Population by Ownership Type, 2019. https://www.kff.org/other/state-indicator/emergency-room-visits-by-ownership/?currentTimeframe=3&sortModel=%7B%22colId%22:%22Location%22,%22sort%22:%22asc%22%7D

Kim KH and Sobal J. Religion, social support, fat intake and physical activity. Public Health Nutrition. 2004. 7: 773–781.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.13.24315408; this version posted October 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Lardner R, Kang D. Trump has long blasted China's trade practices. His 'God Bless the USA' Bibles were printed there. AP News, 2024. https://apnews.com/article/trump-god-bless-usa-bible-china-32a80611605d4052d8238064bbcace4c?fbclid=IwY2xjawFzf1NleHRuA2FlbQIxMQABHYtAfLVoXj7qFihE61EzWisW_AnBc3YMm66HQZmMlZzfwUAb2D5abJYlhg_aem_WRLj7nYKHOdML4Yiq8bJXA

Leider JP, Castrucci BC, Robins M, et al. The exodus of state and local public health employees: separations started before and continued throughout COVID-19. Health Affairs. 2023. https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/full/10.1377/hlthaff.2022.01251

Lipka M, Wormald B. How religious is your state? Pew Research Center, 2016. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2016/02/29/how-religious-is-your-state/?state=alabama

Matthay EC, Duchowny KA, Riley AR, et al. Occupation and educational attainment characteristics associated with COVID-19 mortality by race and ethnicity in California. JAMA Network Open. 5(4):e228406. 2022. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.8406

MacDorman MF, Race and ethnic disparities in fetal mortality, preterm birth, and infant mortality in the United States: An overview. Seminars in Perinatology. 35:200-208. 2011. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.semperi.2011.02.017.

Moneyrates.com. Best states to make a living in the United States in 2019. https://www-statista-com.yale.idm.oclc.org/statistics/226377/most-affordable-states-in-the-us/

National Association of County and City Health Officials. National Profile of Local Health Departments. 2019. https://www.naccho.org/uploads/downloadable-resources/Programs/Public-Health-Infrastructure/NACCHO_2019_Profile_final.pdf

National Center for Health Statistics. Infant Mortality Rates by State. 2018-2019. https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/pressroom/sosmap/infant_mortality_rates/infant_mortality.htm

National Center for Health Statistics. Number of physicians in patient care per 100,000 resident population, by state: United States, 2018. Health, United States, 2019. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK569310/table/ch2.tab16/

National Institute of Minority Health and Health Disparities, 2018-2021. Mortality. https://hdpulse.nimhd.nih.gov/data-portal/mortality/table?cod=247&cod_options=cod_15&ratetype=*&ratetype_options=ratetype_2&race=00&race_options=race_6&sex=0&sex_options=sex_3&age=001&age_options=age_11&ruralurban=0&ruralurban_options=ruralurban_3&yeargroup=5&yeargroup_options=yearmort_2&statefips=00&statefips_options=area_states&county=01000&county_options=counties_alabama&comparison=counties_to_us&comparison_options=comparison_state&radio_comparison=areas&radio_comparison_options=cods_or_areas

Oreskes N. and Conway E.M. Merchants of Doubt: How a Handful of Scientists Obscured the Truth on Issues from Tobacco Smoke to Global Warming. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2010.

Pew Research Center. Party identification among religious groups and religiously unaffiliated voters. 2024a. https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2024/04/09/party-identification-among-religious-groups-and-religiously-unaffiliated-voters/

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.13.24315408; this version posted October 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Pew Research Center. Frequency of prayer. 2024b. https://www.pewresearch.org/religious-landscape-study/database/frequency-of-prayer/

Rabinowitz PM, Barry M. Environmental Determinants of Health—Time to Redefine the Social History? JAMA. Published online October 03, 2024. doi:10.1001/jama.2024.19490

Robertson, LS. Association of COVID-19 mortality with politics and on-demand testing in 217 U.S. counties. BMC Public Health. 2021. 21:2203. https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1186/s12889-021-12063-2.pdf

Robertson LS. Roads to COVID-19 Containment and Spread. New York: Austin-Macauley Publishers, 2023.

Robertson LS. Dysfunctional: Scientists, Fundamentalists and Politicians. Amazon, 2024.

Rodziewicz TL, Houseman B, Vaqar S, et al. Medical Error Reduction and Prevention. [Updated 2024 Feb 12]. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2024. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK499956/

Tippett R. Mortality and Cause of Death, 1900 v. 2010, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. https://carolinademography.cpc.unc.edu/2014/06/16/mortality-and-cause-of-death-1900-v-2010/

Tiwana MH and Smith J. Faith and vaccination: a scoping review of the relationships between religious beliefs and vaccine hesitancy. BMC Public Health. 2024. 24: 1806. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC11227154/

U.S Bureau of Labor Statistics. Regional and state employment and unemployment – October, 2016. 2016. https://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/laus_11182016.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau. Gini index of income inequality, 2019. https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT1Y2019.B19083?q=gini%20&g=010XX00US$0400000&tp=true&tid=ACSDT1Y2019.B19083

U.S Census Bureau. The Urban Population as a Percentage of the Total Population by U.S. Region and State (1790-2020). 2024. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Urbanization_in_the_United_States

Wintemute GJ, Crawford A., Robinson SL et al. Firearm ownership and support for political violence in the United States. JAMA Network Open. 2024. 7(4):e243623. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.3623

Woodward M, Oliphant J, Lowe G, et al. Contribution of contemporaneous risk factors to social inequality in coronary heart disease and all causes mortality. Preventive Medicine. 36: 561-568. 2003. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0091-7435(03)00010-0.